

IMAC QA Subcommittee Meeting Minutes July 25, 2005

Members Present

Jackie Bennett, Racine County; John Haine, DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Bernadette Connolly, DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee County; Chris Elms, Dane County; Pam Lohaus, DHFS/OSF/Southern Region; Marilyn Rudd; DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Marcia Williamson, DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Vicki Jessup, DHFS/DCHF/BEM; Donna King, DHFS/DHCF/BEM

Via Phone Conference

Lorie Mueller, LaCrosse County

Members Absent

Kathy Judd, Dane County; Allison Espeseth, Covering Kids and Family; Jennifer Winter, Managed Health Services; Lisa Hanson, DHFS/DCHF/BEM; Brian Fangmeier, DHFS/DHCF/BEM;

June 27, 2005 Meeting Minutes

The June minutes were reviewed and approved.

IM Contract Modifications

Language has been drafted, but has not yet been approved by the Workload and Finance Committee.

FS Payment Accuracy Update

John informed the group that Wisconsin will not be sanctioned for 2004, and can not be sanctioned until 2007. Wisconsin is still negotiating the at-risk money tied to the \$3.5 million sanction from 2002. Analysis has been started to determine if there is an upward trend in the error rate for balance of state. John pointed out that caseloads have been shifting from Milwaukee to the balance of state- both Dane and Racine are approaching "Big 10" status (issuance of at least \$10 million in Food Share benefits per year). Although all five large agencies (Dane, Racine, Rock, Kenosha and Brown) have experienced recent caseload increases, only two agencies have demonstrated an increased error rate. Although the perception is that workload increases have a direct correlation to payment accuracy, the data doesn't necessarily demonstrate that. There are other variables to consider in addition to workload increases such as electronic case file (ECF) and CARES worker web (CWW) pilot participation.

Below are the active error rates for the first six months of FFY 2005:

State	5.3%
Milwaukee	6.2%
Balance of state	4.6%

Contract Modification –Customer Service

The primary goal of centralized customer service surveys is to increase standardization so that analysis and federal reporting are more feasible. FNS and the Department seek information about smaller agencies which aren't included in the QC sample in sufficient numbers (or at all). Further, there is interest in establishing baseline data. The Department is moving in a data-driven direction.

Contract Modification – QA Performance Standards to Replace QAP

There is a proposal to replace the Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) requirement with two performance standards that address timely processing and second party reviews. The proposed performance standards apply to both Medicaid and Food Share. The Department plans to share draft language with the Workload and Finance Committee for their feedback.

Contract Modification – Liquidated Damages for Uncorrected Case Errors

It is expected that errors identified through Food Share QC, MEQC and PERM are corrected by the agency within 30 days of notification. The Department is planning to enhance the IMQA system so that case-specific corrective actions can be automatically tracked. If errors are not corrected within required timeframes, agencies will be subject to a fiscal penalty of \$250 per case.

Second Party Review Requirements

The “two per worker per month” is a moving target. Agencies have fluctuations in the numbers of workers at any given time and there is also an increasing amount of specialization, supervisors carrying small caseloads to assist with heavy workloads, etc.

IMAC has asked this committee to consider alternatives and present a recommendation. Marilyn agreed to gather information about caseload sizes- by agency and by program combination. This topic will be the focus of our August meeting

CARES Worker Web

The group briefly discussed experiences with the training materials and potential impacts on our error rates because of the “learning curve” and some of the changes from the mainframe such as relevancy designation.

Next Meeting

Monday August 22, 2005

Notetaker: Brian Fangemeier

Agenda Item(s)

- Alternative method for determining the number of second party reviews required per county

Submitted by: Vicki Jessup